

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed September 11, 2007, claims 1 – 13 were rejected. In response, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 5 – 7, canceled claim 4, and added new claims 14 – 20. Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amended claims and the below-provided remarks.

### Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5 and 7 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicants have not rewritten the claims in view of the below provided remarks.

### Response to Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, and 8 – 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Smedley (U.S. Pat. No. 5,559,467). Additionally, claims 1 – 3 and 8 – 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Stanley (U.S. Pat. No. 5,513,094). However, Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are patentable over Smedley and Stanley for the reasons provided below.

### Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of original claim 4. Applicants assert that claim 1 is not anticipated because neither Smedley nor Stanley disclose “wherein the ripple suppression circuit is configured to drive the first transistor of the at least one pair of transistors *in a linear region* of the first transistor” as recited in original claim 4 and now in amended claim 1. As is well known, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (MPEP 2131). Applicants have not found any reference in Smedley or Stanley to the above-identified limitation. Additionally, Applicants point out that the Office action does not identify where the limitations of original claim 4 are found in the prior art references. Because

the limitations of original claim 4 are not disclosed by Smedley or Stanley, Applicants assert that amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Smedley or Stanley.

#### Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9

Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9 are dependent on claim 1. Applicants assert that the limitations of claims 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9 are not disclosed by Smedley or Stanley. As with original claim 4, Applicants point out that the Office action does not identify where the limitations of claim 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9 are found in the prior art references. Because the limitations of original claims 2, 3, 6, 8, and 9 are not disclosed by Smedley or Stanley, Applicants assert that these claims are not anticipated by Smedley or Stanley.

#### Claims 10 and 12

Claims 10 and 12 include limitations related to a “*linear controlled voltage controller*” and “*linear voltage control*.” Applicants assert that the limitations of claims 10 and 12 are not disclosed by Smedley or Stanley. Applicants point out that the Office action does not identify where the limitations of claims 10 and 12 are found in the prior art references. Specifically, the Office action does not indicate where Smedley or Stanley disclose a “linear controlled voltage controller” and “linear voltage control.” Because the limitations of claim 10 and 12 are not disclosed by Smedley or Stanley, Applicants assert that claims 10 and 12 are not anticipated by Smedley or Stanley.

#### Claims 11 and 13

Claims 11 and 13 include limitations related to a driving an amplifier transistor “*in a linear region*.” Applicants assert that the limitations of claims 11 and 13 are not disclosed by Smedley or Stanley. Applicants point out that the Office action does not identify where the limitations of claims 11 and 13 are found in the prior art references. Specifically, the Office action does not indicate where Smedley or Stanley disclose an amplifier transistor that is driven “in a linear region.” Because the limitations of claim 11 and 13 are not disclosed by Smedley or Stanley, Applicants assert that claims 11 and 13 are not anticipated by Smedley or Stanley.

#### New Claim 14

New claim 14 is formed by the combination of original claims 1 and 2. Applicants assert that claim 14 is not anticipated because neither Smedley nor Stanley disclose a ripple suppression circuit that includes “***a linearly controlled voltage controller***” as recited in claim 14. As is well known, “[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (MPEP 2131). Applicants have not found any reference in Smedley or Stanley to the above-identified limitation. Again, Applicants point out that the Office action does not identify where the limitations of original claim 2 are found in the prior art references. Because the limitations of original claim 2 are not disclosed by Smedley or Stanley, Applicants assert that new claim 14 is not anticipated by Smedley or Stanley.

#### New Claims 15 – 19

New claim 15 is similar to original claim 3, new claim 16 is similar to original claims 4 and 5, new claim 17 is similar to original claims 4 and 7, new claim 18 is similar to original claim 8, and new claim 19 is similar to original claim 9. Claims 16 and 17 should be in allowable condition since they include the limitations of original claims 5 and 7, respectively. As stated above, the limitations of claim 15, 18, and 19 are not fully addressed in the Office action.

#### New Claim 20

New claim 20 is formed by the combination of original claims 1 and 7. Applicants assert that new claim 20 is in allowable condition because it includes the limitations from original claim 7.

## CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments, the new claims, and the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-3444** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-3444** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: December 11, 2007

Mark A. Wilson  
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham  
PMB: 348  
2530 Berryessa Road  
San Jose, CA 95132  
Phone: (925) 249-1300  
Fax: (925) 249-0111